

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/712,900	11/13/2003 Baoqing Gong		200144.405D1	9482	
500	7590 03/02/2005		EXAMINER		
	LLECTUAL PROPER	BALASUBRAMANIAN	BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN		
701 FIFTH A SUITE 6300	VE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, V	VA 98104-7092	1624			

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\mathcal{A}	

		A 12 4	In a No.	Annlicant(a)				
		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/712,9	10/712,900 GONO		NG ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit				
			aman Balasubramanian	1624				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	correspondence ac	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>09 December 2</u>	<u>2004</u> .	٠				
2a)	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.					
. 3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>8-16</u> is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>8-16</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co			-			
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)□	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment	ds)							
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pnation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	O-152)			

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included amendment to claims 8 and 12-16, filed on 12/9/2004, is made of record. Claims 8-16 are pending.

In view of applicants' response, all 112 rejections made in the previous office action have been obviated. However, the following new rejections apply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moriarty et al US 2002/0065270.

Instant claims are method of use claims and the compounds of the instant claims were previously rejected as anticipated and or obvious over several prior art references in the parent application 10/236,084.

Instant claims 8 and its dependent claims 12-16 relate to method of inhibiting LPAAT-β comprising contacting LPAAT-β with an effective amount of the triazine compound shown in claim 8. In addition, claims 9-11 recite LPAAT-β found in animal, mammal or human.

Art Unit: 1624

"The invention further relates to methods of treating cancer using said triazines". Hence

Specification in the Field of the Invention recites, besides inhibiting LPAAT-B,

it appears that the term contacting in claim 8, given a broadest interpretation, would

include in-vitro inhibition as well as in-vivo administration to inhibit LPAAT-β and hence

to treat cancer.

Moriarty et al., discloses several trisubstituted triazines as inhibitors of TNF-α useful for treating various diseases including cancer. See page 2, formula I and note the definition of X, Y, W, Z, V, R⁶ and R¹¹. Note when X, Y, W are nitrogens, the Z, V, R⁶ and R¹¹ groups overlap with instant R¹, NR²R³ and NR⁴R⁵ and therefore the triazine

compounds taught by Moriarty include instant compounds. Page 6, entry 0101 for use

of the compounds for treating cancer. See Table 1-4 shown on pages 38-137 for

examples of triazine compounds made.

Clearly Moriarty et al. discloses several compounds within the scope of the instant claims for use as TNF-a inhibitors useful to treat various diseases including proliferative diseases such as cancer. While the reference does not mention use of the said compounds for inhibiting LPAAT-B, following the teachings of Moriarty et al., one would be administering to a host the said triazine compounds to treat cancer and thus inherently performs the same function as claimed herein. See Ex parte Novitski 26 USPQ2D 1369 as well as the more recent decision. Integra LifeSciences v Merck 50 USPQ2d 1846. Also see West et al., DNA Cell Biol. 16(6): 691-701, 1997, teaches over expression of LPAAT-β enhances TNF-α synthesis. Note also the court held double patenting applies between a mode of action and the treatment of disease if one of

Art Unit: 1624

ordinary skill in the art would know of the connection between the two. See Lilly vs. Barr, 58 USPQ2d 1869, at 1879.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriarty et al. US 2002/0065270

Teachings of Moriarty et al. as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Moriarty et al., discloses several trisubstituted triazines as inhibitors of TNF- α , which include instant compounds claimed herein for treating various diseases including cancer.

Art Unit: 1624

Instant claims require variously substituted anilino group as substituents in the triazine ring.as well as halo, hydroxyl, alkylmercapto, alkoxy, aryloxy as substituents for R¹ besides substituted amino. Moriarty et al. in Table 1-4 exemplifies triamino substituted triazine compounds but not halo, hydroxyl, alkylmercapto, alkoxy, aryloxy.

However, Moriarty et al., teaches the equivalency of exemplified compounds in Table 1-4 with those claimed with various substituents in the definitions of various varible groups on page 2. See page 2, the definition of Z, V, R⁶ and R¹¹ groups. Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds variously substituted in triazine ring with Z, V, R⁶ and R¹¹ groups as permitted by the reference and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM.

The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674.

If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1624

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Venkalaraman Balasubramanian

02/27/2005